

kristin.peckman@w
achovia.com

12/20/2005 10:54
AM

<vegeis@nv.blm.gov>

To

cc

Subject
Comment on BLM Programmatic EIS for
pesticide Vegetation Treatments in
17 Western States

Brian Amme, Project Manager
BLM, P.O. Box 12000
Reno, NV 89520-0006

Mr. Brian Amme,

I have reviewed the Bureau of Land Management's proposal for pesticide applications to public lands in western states. I am urging BLM to choose Option 3 (C) in its proposal, wherein alternative control methods, other than pesticides, would be used. As a citizen owner of these public lands and a user of other public and private lands which would be affected by any precedent set by this proposal, I am deeply concerned with allowing such a large use of pesticides on public lands, including National Monuments and National Conservation areas.

An integral part of this proposal involves aerial spraying of toxic pesticides, which increases negative impacts on non-targeted vegetation, wildlife, and people, including recreationists, tourists, and native peoples (pesticide application areas include Alaska, where native fishing and plant gathering is widespread). Although the proposal claims care would be taken in applying the pesticides in a controlled manner, these chemicals are known to drift much further than anticipated and cause unexpected health and ecological impacts. The pesticides that would be used include persistent and mobile chemicals, including known developmental and reproductive toxins.

U.S. biologists, ecologists and wildlife managers have a vast array of alternative vegetation management tools to choose from, without having to resort to applying toxic chemicals to our public lands. Please choose

Option 3 (C).

Thank you for your care and consideration,

Kristin Peckman
8131 Webster Dr.
Roanoke, VA 24019